DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 795 EA 014 823

AUTHOR Plog, Michael
TITLE Child-Find Self-Audit.
INSTITUTION Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield. Div. of Specialized Education Services.
PUB DATE Jun 82
NOTE 41p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Computer Programs; Cost Effectiveness; Diagnostic Tests; *Disabilities; *Evaluation Methods; *Handicap Identification; Preschool Children; Preschool Education; Preschool Tests; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Publicity; Records (Forms); Screening Tests; Special Education
IDENTIFIERS *Child Find

ABSTRACT

School districts attempting to locate handicapped preschool children who may need special educational services can use the self-auditing methods in this handbook to measure the effectiveness of district childfind activities. The Delphi technique was used to develop a consensus concerning self-auditing methods among selected university professors and Illinois school district and State Department of Education personnel. An introduction discusses general types of childfind activities, including mass public awareness campaigns, contacts with special groups, screening processes, and agency referrals. Five sections then present methods and worksheets for discovering (1) what proportion of children are being screened; (2) how many preschool children need special pre-enrollment educational services; (3) how accurate past screening efforts have been; (4) how effective general and specific public awareness activities have been; and (5) what the costs of childfind efforts are, for different types of expenses and funding sources. Two appendices provide a microcomputer program for the self-audit methods and sample copies of the worksheets. (Author/RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218795

CHILD-FIND

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Reisinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SELF-AUDIT

EA 013 823

FOREWORD

The Illinois State Board of Education is pleased to present the Child-Find Self-Audit. We hope this document will prove beneficial to local practitioners conducting child-find activities.

The basic support for the self-audit was provided by Ms. Beth Bandy of the Department of Specialized Educational Services. Dr. Michael Plog of the Program Evaluation and Assessment Section designed and wrote the document and will respond to any questions or comments.

Donald G. Gill
State Superintendent of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

I. Children Being Screened. 5

II. Preschool Children Receiving Special Education Services 9

III. Measuring Accuracy of Past Identification Efforts 10

IV. Measuring Effectiveness of Awareness Activities. 15

V. Cost Analysis. 19

Appendix I: Microcomputer Program For Self-Audit. 24

Appendix II: Sample Worksheets. 33

INTRODUCTION

The child-find self-audit package has been prepared to assist administrators of local education agencies to collect and interpret information about their child-find activities. The information gathered and analyzed is for local use; it will not be reported to the Illinois State Board of Education.

This self-audit package is limited to the unserved population in the age group of 3 to 5 years. The underserved population is not addressed. Based upon local circumstances and needs, any one or a number of the techniques for measuring the effectiveness of child-find programs outlined in this document can be utilized. Each administrator is encouraged to select the section(s) of this document that appropriately suit local circumstances.

The self-audit package does not attempt to measure compliance with either state or federal laws or regulations. Rather, it describes methods to measure the effectiveness of child-find activities.

Background Information - The Delphi Study

During school years 1980-81 and 1981-82, the Department of Planning, Research and Evaluation of the Illinois State Board of Education conducted a Delphi study. The results of the Delphi study have been used to develop this package.

The Delphi approach is a research technique consisting of a series of repeated questionnaires. A summary of responses to each questionnaire is returned to all participants, along with another questionnaire. In the Delphi reported here, consensus was reached after respondents were questioned three times. The Delphi technique has been a useful tool in governmental and private business research for prediction and consensus building.

Three groups of participants were included in the Delphi study concerning child-find practices in Illinois. One group included persons working in local districts, joint agreements or regional programs (LEA/JEA/RA), who currently operate child-find programs. A second group included university professors teaching future special education personnel and consulting with agencies conducting child-find programs. The third group consisted of employees of the Illinois State Board of Education who had conducted child-find activities in the past or had been involved in monitoring child-find activities.

The results of the Delphi questionnaires are presented in this document for the purpose of information sharing. They are not presented as standards for child-find programs nor as expectations on the part of the Illinois State Board of Education.

Awareness Activities

A comprehensive child-find program must have public awareness. Public awareness activities should fully describe the rights of parents and handicapped children, the procedures for enrolling a child in school and the types of programs available for handicapped children.

Participants in the Delphi study were asked to list the activities they believed would be most effective for a child-find program. Their responses were grouped into four areas: mass public awareness, special group contacts, the screening process, and other suggestions. Each group is discussed and presented more graphically in Figure 1.

Mass Public Awareness

Several activities can be conducted to make the general public aware of child-find programs. Advertisements can be made through mass media--newspapers, radio, television. If the population warrants it, such advertisements or public presentations should be provided in languages other than English. Personal contact can be made with all households in the community through mass mailings or telephone communications. Notices can be posted via placards on mass transit vehicles, signs or posters placed in store windows, or on bulletin boards in large employment centers. A hotline could be established and advertised.

Special Group Contacts

Child-find activities can also be brought to the attention of the local public through contacts with special groups. Contacts can be made with establishments in the medical field (private physicians, clinics, nurses, dentists). Social services/social welfare agencies, PTA and other community groups such as churches may also be contacted. Inservice training, especially for preschool teachers, may be offered to assist regular education personnel in identifying handicapped children.

Screening Process

Some of the Delphi participants felt that awareness activities could be supported by providing adequate personnel, supplies, and materials for screening and diagnostic teams. Other related suggestions included providing annual and second-level screenings, conducting screenings in places other than public school buildings (i.e., parochial schools, local stores, and large industrial centers in the community), establishing a "high risk registry," and developing a statewide screening campaign. One suggestion, argued against by some participants, was to register children at age 3 for kindergarten and screen at the same time.

Other Suggestions

Miscellaneous suggestions gathered during the Delphi study included a well-established referral system with the community, emphasis on diagnostics, the team approach, and "parenting" (no explanation provided).

Figure 1.

Possible Activities for a Child-Find Program

MASS PUBLIC AWARENESS, through...

_____ advertisements (radio, television, newspapers).
_____ bilingual presentations, if necessary.
_____ direct mail to all citizens in the area.
_____ telephone calls to residents in the area.
_____ placards on mass transit vehicles.
_____ establishment of a hot line telephone number.
_____ signs and posters in store windows, etc.
_____ notices sent in utility bills.
_____ bulletin boards in large public employment centers, e.g., factories, where parents can see them.

SPECIAL GROUP CONTACTS, with...

_____ medical fields, i.e., doctors, nurses, clinics, etc.
_____ social welfare agencies.
_____ regular education teachers (including pre-school teachers), for inservice to recognize handicapping conditions.
_____ PTA and related organizations.
_____ community groups, including ministers, church groups, and realtors.

SCREENING PROCESS, by...

_____ providing adequate personnel, supplies, and materials for screening and diagnostic teams.
_____ second-level screening and rescreening at least annually, and more often, if possible.
_____ development of a high risk registry to identify and monitor at risk babies.
_____ development of a statewide screening campaign.
_____ conducting screening in parochial schools, local stores, and at larger industries in the community--to make screening easier for parents.
_____ decentralizing sites for screening, in specially targeted areas of the community.

OTHER SUGGESTIONS, including...

_____ a well-established referral system of which all elements of the community are aware. Referrals would lead to direct evaluation.
_____ parenting as an important factor in the child-find program.
_____ diagnostics are part of the child-find services. After the screening has taken place and high risk children rescreened, a team provides for in-depth study and prescriptive approaches to meeting needs of the children identified.

Sources for Referrals

In order to maintain a well-rounded child-find program, it is necessary for the local education agency to maintain a good referral system with community agencies. With such a system in place, social service agencies, after identifying handicapped children, will refer them to the local education agency. The agencies most often mentioned in the Delphi study are listed below:

State agencies:
- Department of Children and Family Services
- Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities
- Department of Public Aid
- Department of Public Health
- Division of Services for Crippled Children

Private Agencies:
- Associations for Retarded Citizens
- Churches (who may be sponsoring national origin minority families)
- Easter Seals
- Family Service Centers
- Illinois Epilepsy Chapters
- Lions Clubs
- Nursery School Programs (including day care facilities and religious school programs)
- Private Counselling Services
- United Cerebral Palsy
- United Way Agencies

Other:
- Head Start Programs
- Local Rehabiliation Centers
- Medical Groups and Organizations (including doctors, pediatricians, hospitals, clinics, and visiting nurse programs)
- Other School Districts and Special Education Cooperatives
- University Diagnostic Clinics
- "Any program serving children aged birth to three"

CHAPTER I

CHILDREN BEING SCREENED

How Many Children Should Be Screened?

It is unrealistic to expect a child-find program to screen every child living in the community. No matter how extensive an awareness campaign is, some parents will not bring their children to a screening. The number of children that can reasonably be expected to be screened by a child-find program depends on the local circumstances--including size of the population, size of the geographic area, resources available to the child-find program, and the attitudes of residents (i.e., how local residents feel about the school system). Naturally, each child-find program should attempt to locate and screen as many children as possible.

One question in the Delphi study asked about the proportion of children to screen. The results of the question are presented in Table I, below.

Table I

"WHAT PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN (AGES 3 TO 5) IN A COMMUNITY SHOULD A WELL-RUN CHILD-FIND PROGRAM REASONABLY EXPECT TO LOCATE AND SCREEN?"

Response	LEA/JEA/RA	University	State Board	Total
45% to 65%	53.3%	12.5%	12.5%	31.0%
65% to 85%	38.5%	87.5%	75.0%	62.1%
"Blank" or other response	7.7%	-0-	12.5%	6.8%

Over half of local-level personnel thought a well-run child-find program should locate and screen between 45% and 65% of the children in a community. University and State Board of Education personnel had somewhat higher expectations of a well-run child-find program. The majority of respondents in each of these categories thought between 65% and 85% of the children should be screened.

It must be stressed that there is no "correct" answer for the number of children in a community that should be screened. The above information is not presented as a standard for any child-find program, but is simply to share the thoughts of people who have operated (or are currently operating) similar programs.

Estimating the Percentage of 3 to 5-Year-Old Children Screened

The method presented in this section will accomplish two things: first, it will help to estimate the number of 3 to 5-year-olds in a community; and second, it will help determine the proportion of that 3 to 5-year-old population actually screened. Census data for the last ten years has been used to determine the proportion of 3 to 5-year-old children with school-age

children. The proportions for Illinois have been compared with the proportions for the entire United States, each region of the country, and several midwestern states. The comparisons among the geographic areas examined were not significantly different. Thus, while population may be unevenly divided, the proportion of 3 to 5-year-olds compared with school-age children is not. (It may be inappropriate to use the method explained here in other parts of the country, such as the Southwest. The calculations were conducted specific to the midwestern portion of the country.)

The process used to estimate the number of 3 to 5-year-olds in a community is much simpler than the procedure noted above (used to derive the estimating process). Worksheet I should be used to estimate the number of 3 to 5-year-old children in a given area. The same worksheet can be used to determine the proportion of children screened by a child-find program. Each step of the process will be discussed in detail below.

Line 1. In Line 1, write the number of students enrolled in all schools in the area served by the child-find program. This number should include students in nonpublic schools, as well as students sent from any school in the area to facilities located outside the geographic boundary of the child-find program. All children having legal residence in the geographic area should be counted. The Superintendent of the Educational Service Region (SESR) is one of the best resources for this information. If the child-find program has the same boundaries as the SESR, only one number needs to be obtained. If the child-find program covers a portion of an educational service region, obtain the proportion of the child-find program area to the broader area, and use that number as the estimate of school-age students. Another resource, requiring more time to compute, is each local school district in the area served by the child-find program. A total of all students enrolled provides the number for Line 1.

Line 2. Multiplying Line 1 by .1216 will provide the minimum number of 3 to 5-year-olds in the area served by the child-find program. It would be highly unusual to have fewer 3 to 5-year-olds in the area.

Line 3. Multiply the number from Line 1 by .136 to obtain the maximum number of 3 to 5-year-olds in the area served by the child-find program.

EXAMPLE: It has been determined (by contacting the SESR) that 15,000 students are enrolled in public and nonpublic schools in the area to be served. Insert the number 15,000 in Line 1. Multiplying 15,000 by .1216 yields 1,824, which is to be recorded in Line 2. Multiplying 15,000 by .136 yields 2,040, to be recorded in Line 3. It is reasonable to expect that there will be between 1,824 and 2,040 children in the area between the ages of 3 and 5.

Line 4. Enter the number of children screened by the child-find program for the year in question. Also include the number of children referred to the child-find program by other agencies

SAMPLE FORMAT -- Distributed as a sample format for local discretionary use only. May be modified and/or copied by local program personnel to meet specific needs.

Worksheet I

ESTIMATING NUMBER OF 3 TO 5 YEAR OLD CHILDREN IN A COMMUNITY

1. Number of students in schools in area to be served 15,000

2. Minimum number of 3 to 5 year olds (Multiply Line 1 by .1216) 1,824

3. Maximum number of 3 to 5 year olds (Multiply Line 1 by .136) 2,040

4. Number of children screened 600

5. Minimum percent screened (Line 4 divided by Line 3. Multiply result by 100.) 29.4%

6. Maximum percent screened (Line 4 divided by Line 2. Multiply result by 100.) 32.9%

SAMPLE

SAMPLE CONCLUSION STATEMENT:

In — (Year), we screened 600 (Line 4) children ages 3 to 5, which is between 29.4 (Line 5) % and 32.9 (Line 6) % of the total 3 to 5 year olds in the community.

providing services. These children may be currently receiving special education services and may have been previously screened.

Line 5. Divide the number in Line 4 by the number in Line 3. To obtain a percent, multiply the result by 100. This is the smallest percentage of children screened by the child-find program.

Line 6. Divide the number in Line 4 by the number in Line 2. To obtain a percent, multiply the result by 100. This is the largest percentage of children screened by the child-find program.

A sample conclusion statement is provided on Worksheet I for the convenience of the child-find program managers. Any conclusion statement, accurately reflecting the information from Worksheet I, can be substituted.

Some people may prefer to use a different method of estimating the number of 3 to 5-year-olds in their community. One such way is to determine the number of students in grades K-2, and assume about the same number of 3 to 5-year-olds exist in the area. If such a method is used, do not forget to include children enrolled in nonpublic schools. The difficulty of using this approach is the time required to contact several different places.

Another method of estimating the number of 3 to 5-year-olds involves the use of birth and death records. This system may be accurate, but requires a very stable population. If an area has many families moving in and out, birth and death records may not be appropriate.

Any estimation system can be used, as long as the system is appropriate to local conditions and is acceptable by the parties involved. No estimation system--including the procedure used in Worksheet I--will be totally accurate all the time, except in the most stable of communities.

It is possible, given adequate records of the child-find program, to complete Worksheet I for several years for one program. The current results can be compared with past results to determine whether or not operational changes have influenced the percentage of children located and screened. Information obtained from such a comparison may be shared with other child-find programs in order to gain a broader base of ideas and suggestions to meet the local goals of the local child-find program.

CHAPTER II

PRESCHOOL CHILDREN RECEIVING SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES

The primary function of preschool screening is to identify children who need special education services before they enroll in school. Two major questions can be asked about this group of children: how many children should receive special education services and what types of handicaps can be identified.

The Number of Children to Serve

One question from the Delphi study asked for the percentage of children ages 3 to 5 who are in need of special education services. The greatest consensus (93.1% of those returning the questionnaires) was that between 5% and 15% of preschool children need special education services. This range, 5 to 15 percent, is rather large, but given the nature of early childhood education, reducing the range might be meaningless.

Types of Handicaps to Serve

Delphi participants were also asked about each of the handicapping conditions. For each handicap recognized on the FACTS form, participants were asked at what age they could most reasonably expect to identify a child having that handicap. All Delphi participants agreed that the six handicapping conditions listed below could be identified by the age of 5 years.

Trainable Mentally Handicapped	Physically Handicapped
Deaf	Visually Impaired
Deaf/Blind	Hard of Hearing

Two other handicapping conditions, Educable Mentally Handicapped and Speech/Language Impairment, were thought to be identifiable by age 5 by three-quarters or more of the Delphi participants.

Some of the Delphi participants noted that some children who would (or might) be classified in the other handicapping conditions could be considered "at risk" by age 5. There was no consensus, however, for the handicapping conditions other than those listed above.

Since many preschool special education programs do not attach specific handicapping conditions to the children served, this information needs to be interpreted carefully.

CHAPTER III

MEASURING ACCURACY OF PAST IDENTIFICATION EFFORTS

One important question for managers of child-find programs is to determine how accurate the early identification of special education children has been. The procedure explained in this portion of the self-audit will provide a way of measuring the effectiveness of past screening efforts, if the following conditions are met.

1. Appropriate records of past screening activities are available.

2. There is a high degree of confidence in the current placement of special education students in primary grades.

3. People are available for consultation who have knowledge about early childhood special education and screening, but were not participants in screening activities.

Essentially, the procedure explained here is how to examine primary grade students currently receiving special education services, for the purpose of determining which of those students could have been identified, but were not. The determination is a judgment requiring professional expertise to be made by a panel of knowledgeable people.

The procedure for determining accuracy of past identfication efforts is explained in a series of steps. Worksheet II and Worksheet III should be used during this procedure. Both worksheets will be discussed in the outline of the steps that follow.

STEP 1. The first step is to identify those primary students currently receiving special education services. The decision of which grades are to be considered can vary with local circumstances. Normally, it is suggested that grades K-3 be considered "primary." A list should be made of each student receiving special education services for the grade levels selected. Worksheet II is provided for this purpose. More than one copy of Worksheet II may be necessary. (In districts with large enrollments, it may be inappropriate to consider every primary student currently receiving special education services. A random sample of students can be selected, if the total number of cases to be examined is not easily manageable.)

STEP 2. The list of students (on Worksheet II) is to be divided into two groups--those identified for special education before entering school and those identified after entering school. In order to make this determination, refer to past screening records and other available records. Each student's cumulative folder should provide the required information. A sample of Worksheet II is provided, with information for 24 students. (The blank portion of Worksheet II will be used in the following section of the self-audit.)

STEP 3. Considering just those students identified for special education services after entering school, determine which were screened between the ages of 3 to 5 years. This will require records from past screening

SAMPLE FORMAT -- Distributed as a sample format for local discretionary use only. May be modified and/or copied by local program personnel to meet specific needs.

Worksheet II
PRIMARY STUDENTS RECEIVING SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES

NAME OF STUDENT	Identified After Entering School	Screened While Aged 3 - 5	Judged as Identifiable	
Charles Adams	✓	✓	✓	
Olympia Brown	✓			
Lydia Child				
John Dietrich	✓	✓		
Thomas Emlyn	✓			
Sophia Fahs	✓	✓	✓	
Charlotte Gilman				
Clara Helvis	✓	✓		
Helen Jackson	✓	✓	✓	
Thomas King	✓			
Charles Lyell				
Fred Melcher	✓			
Andrew Norton	✓	✓		
William Osgood	✓	✓	✓	
John Palfrey				
Josiah Quincy	✓	✓		
David Reed				
Charles Sprague				
Celia Thaxter	✓	✓	✓	
Judith Urquhart	✓			
Catherine Vogel	✓	✓	✓	
Thomas Whittemore	✓			
Michael Young				
Agnes Zuniga	✓	✓		
TOTALS	24	17	11	6
(Carry totals to worksheet III)	(Line 1)	(Line 2)	(Line 3)	(Line 4)

SAMPLE

activities if the information is not available in students' cumulative folders. A check should be placed in the third column of Worksheet II for each student screened between the ages of 3 and 5.

STEP 4. It is now time to closely examine each of the students identified after entering school who had been screened during the ages of 3 to 5. (These will be all students with a check in the third column of Worksheet II.) The question to be answered is which of these students could have been identified at ages 3 to 5. In order to determine this, a panel of knowledgeable experts will form a professional judgment. In order to reduce bias, people selected for the panel should not have been involved in the screening process of the students in question. The panel will have to consider each child having a check in column 3 of Worksheet II and determine--based on the best possible evidence--which children could have been identified during a preschool screening. Children moving into the district after entering school, for example, could not be identified by a preschool screening.

The panel may want to consult permanent records of the students, along with past screening records and teacher comments. In some cases, it may be appropriate to examine records from preschool experiences of the children, such as day centers. After examining the available information, the panel will have to determine if the child could have been identified during a mass screening for 3-5-year-olds.

The idea of this step is fairly easy to express in a few words. The time involved for this step, however, will be longer than for any other step of the procedure. It may be difficult to make judgments in some cases. The task will be easier if the panel members are familiar with the individual students being considered.

STEP 5. The information recorded on Worksheet II is now to be transferred to Worksheet III. Worksheet III describes the calculations to be performed on the numbers obtained from Worksheet II. The total number of names from Worksheet II is listed on Line 1 of Worksheet III. The total number of checks in column 2 of Worksheet II is recorded on Line 2 of Worksheet III. Similarily, the total number of checks from columns 3 and 4 of Worksheet II are recorded on Lines 3 and 4 of Worksheet III. A sample of Worksheet III, based on the information from the sample of Worksheet II, is provided for the ease of understanding of the reader.

Do not dispose of Worksheet II yet. There are other uses for the list of students to be discussed in the next section of the self-audit.

STEP 6. The calculations on Worksheet III should now be completed. To determine the percentage of students not identified by the preschool screening, divide Line 2 by Line 4, then multiply by 100. Enter the number obtained on Line 5 of Worksheet III.

To determine the percentage of students accurately identified by the preschool screening, subtract Line 5 of Worksheet III from 100. Record this number in Line 6. This number represents one measure of effectiveness (or accuracy) of past screening efforts. A sample conclusion is provided on Worksheet III.

SAMPLE FORMAT -- Distributed as a sample format for local discretionary use only. May be modified and/or copied by local program personnel to meet specific needs.

Worksheet III
MEASURING ACCURACY OF PAST IDENTIFICATION EFFORTS

1. Number of primary students currently receiving special education services (From Worksheet II) - - - - 24

2. Number of students from Line 1 who were identified after entering school (From Worksheet II) - - - - 17

3. Number of students from Line 2 who were screened during ages of 3-5 (From Worksheet II) - - - - - - - 11

4. Number of students from Line 3 who are judged by the panel as identifiable at ages 3-5 (From Worksheet II) - - - - - - -

AN ADDITIONAL STEP. After completing Worksheets II and III, another step may be helpful to determine the accuracy of the screening process. Each of the students represented on Line 4 of Worksheet III (experienced preschool screening, but were not identified as needing special education services) could be reexamined. There should be an effort to identify the reason(s) these students were not identified. For example, the screening instruments may be excellent for identification of some types of handicapping conditions, but less effective for identification of others. Of course, some children do not exhibit the need for special education services until they are in a formal classroom setting.

Discussions between panel members, special education administrators, individuals conducting the screening, and special education teachers may help to locate the reasons for the lack of preschool identification. Whatever reasons are found, the local administrators will need to make a decision concerning the need for corrective action.

CHAPTER IV

MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS OF AWARENESS ACTIVITIES

This portion of the self-audit presents two procedures for measuring the effectiveness of awareness activities. The first uses past results to examine effectiveness of awareness; the second compares different activities to determine which is the most effective. Each procedure will be presented separately.

PROCEDURE 1: Using Past Results.

This procedure for measuring the effectiveness of awareness makes use of Worksheet II, the list of students which was developed in the previous chapter. From the list of children receiving special education services, it is rather easy to determine which children did not receive preschool screening. (All those children checked in column 2 of Worksheet II, but not checked in column 3.) This group of children represents the most significant gap in the screening efforts of the child-find program. By determining any similarities among these children, it is possible to direct future screening activities.

Some possible topics to check for similarities are listed below. Local agency personnel may wish to add others based on specific local situations.

- Geographic area of residence
- Socioeconomic status (or level of education) of parents
- Number of older siblings
- Length of residence in community
- Type of handicapping condition
- Religious affiliation of parents

It is suggested that Worksheet II be used to examine similarities of children missed by the screening efforts. The right half of Worksheet II was not used earlier. Space is available, however, for comparisons using the procedure described here.

A sample of Worksheet II is shown, presenting examples of some similarities. The sample has the same information as that used in the previous section along with additional data.

In this example, five additions (represented by columns on Worksheet II) are used: a) children who were not screened during ages 3-5 years, b) area of residence within the region (North, South, East, and West), c) occupation of parents (only one occupation is listed in the example), d) the number of siblings of each child, and e) the handicapping condition of each child.

The number of children who did not receive preschool screening in the sample is far too small for any worthwhile generalizations. For illustrative purposes, however, it can be noted that four of the six came from the northern part of the area served by the child-find program. In this example, the child-find program managers could strengthen awareness activities in the northern part of the area in order to screen more children who may require special education services.

SAMPLE FORMAT -- Distributed as a sample format for local discretionary use only. May be modified and/or copied by local program personnel to meet specific needs.

Worksheet II
PRIMARY STUDENTS RECEIVING SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES

NAME OF STUDENT	Identified After Entering School	Screened While Aged 3-5	Judged as Identifiable	Not Screened	Area	Occupation	Sibling	Hand. Cond.
Charles Adams	✓	✓	✓					
Olympia Brown	✓			✓	N	lawyer	0	EMH
Lydia Child								
John Dietrich	✓	✓						
Thomas Emlyn	✓			✓	S	computer	1	LD
Sophia Fahs	✓	✓	✓					
Charlotte Gilman								
Clara Helvis	✓	✓						
Helen Jackson	✓	✓	✓					
Thomas King	✓			✓	E	bus driver	2	TMH
Charles Lyell								
Fred Melcher	✓			✓	N	clerk	4	BD
Andrew Norton	✓	✓						
William Osgood	✓	✓	✓					
John Palfrey								
Josiah Quincy	✓	✓						
David Reed								
Charles Spear								
Celia Thaxter	✓	✓	✓					
Judith Urquhart	✓			✓	N	newspaper	1	LD
Catherine Vogel	✓	✓	✓					
Thomas Whittemore	✓			✓	N	accountant	3	EMH
Michael Young								
Agnes Zuniga	✓	✓						
TOTALS 24	17	11	6					
(Carry totals to worksheet III)	(Line 1)	(Line 2)	(Line 3)	(Line 4)				

SAMPLE

In an actual application of this procedure, managers of child-find programs can better focus awareness activities to locate and identify children who might have been missed by the screening.

PROCEDURE 2: Comparison of Different Activities.

> "We have a lot of awareness activities for our screening program. We send flyers home with school-age pupils, put spots on the radio, an article in the local newspaper, and even three billboards in town. I'd like to know which of these activities gives us our best return."

The procedure explained in this section of the self-audit may not provide a complete answer for the director of special education quoted above, but will provide information for intelligent comparisons to be made.

The task becomes one of differentiating among the awareness activities used in the child-find program. One way of doing this is to have telephone numbers provided for each of the awareness techniques. Parents call the local agency to arrange an appointment for screening. If the director quoted above can have four different telephone lines, one number can be associated with each type of awareness activity. People answering the telephones simply log each appointment according to the line dialed by the parent. A record is kept of the volume of calls received by each telephone number. This indicates the relative strength of each of the different awareness activities.

A similar technique is to have a flyer printed with information about the screening--date, time, place, purpose, etc. In addition, the flyer is used to record information about the child to be screened, such as name, age, questions related to perceptual abilities, and any other questions needed by the screening staff. These questions would be the same as those normally asked parents at the time of the screening. Parents are then requested to bring the completed flyer and the child to the screening.

The same flyer can be printed on different color paper and distributed by different means. For example, flyers given to school-age children to take home might be green. Flyers distributed at large employment centers, such as factories in the area, would be blue. Those distributed through medical personnel, such as local pediatricians, would be orange. The copy of the flyer printed in the local newspaper would naturally be white. By collecting the flyers during the screening time the local special education director can determine the relative strength of the different awareness activities.

It is possible that in any particular situation, neither of the above ideas may be appropriate. Some method of differentating should be appropriate for most child-find programs. It should be stressed, however, that a total answer of the effectiveness of different awareness activities may never be possible. People learn of screening from more than one source. If asked how they learned about screening, some people will not remember.

The table below shows the results of an example, using different telephone numbers for different types of awareness activities. In the example, four techniques for awareness are used: sending flyers home with school-age children, a notice in the local newspaper, a radio advertisement, and the use of billboards. Each awareness technique was assigned a different telephone number. When parents called for screening appointments, records were kept of the volume of calls for each telephone number.

Table 2
Analysis of Awareness Activities

Type of Awareness	Telephone Number	Volume of Response	Percent of Total
Flyers	555-2431	68	30.9%
Newspaper Ad	555-2432	53	24.1%
Radio	555-2433	42	19.1%
Billboard	555-2434	57	25.9%
TOTAL		220	100.0%

In the fictitious example above, flyers sent home with school-age children provided the best response; radio advertisement, the worst.

Individual directors of special education can prepare an analysis similar to Table 2. The analysis can be as complex or as simple as desired. For example, it would be possible to include the number of children identified as needing special education services from each of the types of awareness activities.

CHAPTER V

COST ANALYSIS

This portion of the child-find self-audit presents a simplified cost analysis procedure. In many cases, it may be impossible to separate child-find expenses from other special education expenses. The costs incurred by a child-find activity can be so infused with other special education costs that any divisions or separations are artificial. For example, staff and facilities are used for child-find activities, but are also used for other school functions--sometimes not even related to special education. If no child-find activities were conducted by the local agency, some of these expenses would not be reduced.

This presents a philosophical problem for a local administrator wishing to conduct a cost analysis of a child-find program. The cost of a child-find program could mean those expenses that would disappear if child-find were not present. Or, the cost of a child-find program could include those costs the local agency will spend in any case, but are used for child-find. Professional judgment, therefore, will be essential in the procedure described in this portion of the self-audit. Determining what expenses are considered by local administrators to be part of the child-find activities is not always a simple task.

Types of Expenses

There are three major types of expenses for a child-find activity. These are described below and detailed in Worksheet IV, "Cost Analysis of Child-Find Activities."

> Staff. Expenses for staff include the cost of having people plan and implement the child-find activities. Essentially, this will include time spent by staff members multiplied by the pay rate. The cost for substitutes, if necessary, should be included.
>
> Awareness. Expenses for awareness are all those necessary to inform the public about the child-find activities. Printing costs for flyers, for example, would be considered an awareness expense, as well as any paid advertisements needed by the local agency.
>
> Operations. Expenses for the operation of the child-find program are the costs of screening students. These can include materials needed for screening as well as any rent or utilities the local agency has to pay.

It is not necessary for local administrators to use the three types of expenses outlined above. A cost analysis can be conducted using any categories that fit local situations. If beneficial, a cost analysis can be conducted using no divisions of expenses, just considering total expenses.

Types of Funds Available

Child-find programs make use of funds from three sources: local, state, and federal. Each of these types of funds is listed on Worksheet IV for those administrators wanting to use the separation. If desired, a cost analysis can be conducted using only total expenses, without regard to source of funds.

Procedure for Cost Analysis

Worksheet IV is provided to assist in an analysis of costs for child-find activities. The procedure used for Worksheet IV will divide the various expenses for child-find into the categories described above. In addition, a way of determining unit cost is described.

Line 1. All expenses for staff related to the child-find activities are to be entered on Line 1. Include substitute pay, if appropriate. One close approximation is to determine the total staff hours (or days) spent for child find and multiply that amount of time by the average pay. Administrator time should also be counted, if appropriate. The expenses for staff can be classified according to the type of fund used. (Line 1a for local funds; Line 1b for state funds; and Line 1c for federal funds.) If used, Lines 1a, 1b, and 1c should total to Line 1.

Line 2. All expenses for awareness activities should be entered here. Local agencies may have one or more awareness expenses: postage, printing costs, payment for advertisements, production of tapes for radio or television spots. This list is not exhaustive; local situations will vary. As with Line 1, expenses for awareness can be classified according to the type of fund used (local, state, or federal).

Line 3. All operational expenses are to be listed in Line 3. Operational expenses are defined as those necessary for conducting screening, exclusive of personnel costs. For example, some local agencies may need to rent or lease equipment for vision testing, or rent a facility for the screening. Materials necessary for screening are to be counted as operational expenses. Expenses for operations can be classified according to the type of fund (local, state, or federal).

Line 4. Enter here the total of Line 1, Line 2, and Line 3. This represents the total expenses for the child-find program. To determine the total expenses from local funds, sum Lines 1a, 2a, and 3a, then enter that amount in Line 4a. The sum of Lines 1b, 2b, and 3b are the total expenses for child-find from state sources and is to be entered in Line 4b. By adding Lines 1c, 2c, and 3c, the total federal portion of child-find expenses is determined. This number is to be entered in Line 4c.

Line 5. Enter the number of children screened for the particular year under study in Line 5.

Line 6. Enter the number of children referred for diagnosis in Line 6.

Line 7. Enter the number of children identified by the screening procedure as needing special education services in Line 7.

Line 8. Divide the number in Line 4 by the number in Line 5. The result is entered in Line 8. This represents the cost per child screened.

Line 9. Divide the number in Line 4 by the number in Line 7. The result is entered in Line 9. This number is the cost per child identified as needing special education services.

Line 10. Record the total expenses for all special education activities in the local agency for the particular year under study.

Line 11. Divide the number in Line 4 by the number in Line 10. Multiply the result by 100 to obtain the percentage of special education funds used for child-find activities.

A sample conclusion is provided on Worksheet IV. Other conclusions are possible based on the information from Worksheet IV. For example, it may be helpful for administrators to know the proportion of local, state, and federal funds supporting child-find activities in the local agency. To determine the proportion of local funds in the child-find program, divide the number in Line 4a by the number in Line 4. The proportion of state funds is found by dividing the number in Line 4b by the number in Line 4. For federal funds, divide the number in Line 4c by the number in Line 4.

It is also possible to determine the proportion of child-find expenses for staff, awareness, and operations. To determine the proportion of child-find money used for staff, divide the number in Line 1 by the number in Line 4. For the proportion of awareness, divide the number in Line 2 by the number in Line 4. Similarly, Line 3 divided by Line 4 will represent the proportion of child-find expenses for operations.

A cost-analysis procedure can be applied to more specific elements of the child-find program. For example, a more detailed consideration of Table 2 in Chapter IV is presented below.

SAMPLE FORMAT -- Distributed as a sample format for local discretionary use only. May be modified and/or copied by local program personnel to meet specific needs.

Worksheet IV
COST ANALYSIS OF CHILD FIND ACTIVITIES

	LOCAL FUNDS (A)	STATE FUNDS (B)	FEDERAL FUNDS (C)	TOTAL FUNDS
1. Expenses for Staff	14,535	1,368	1,197	(Line 1) 17,100
2. Expenses for Awareness	595	56	49	(Line 2) 700
3. Expenses for Operations	1,020	96	84	(Line 3) 1,200
4. Total Expenses for Child Find (Sum Lines 1, 2, and 3)	16,150	1,520	1,330	(Line 4) 19,000

5. Number of children screened 600

6. Number of children referred for diagnosis 200

7. Number of children identified as needing special education services 150

8. Unit cost for screening (Line 4 divided by Line 5) $31.67

9. Unit cost for identification (Line 4 divided by Line 7) $126.67

10. Total expenses for all of special education in local agency $2,300,000

11. Percent of special education funds used for Child Find activities. (Divide Line 4 by Line 10. Multiply result by 100.) ..... 0.82% (less than 1%)

SAMPLE

SAMPLE CONCLUSION STATEMENT

In — (Year), our screening costs were $19,000 (Line 4). This represents $31.67 (Line 8) dollars for every child screened and is 0.8 (Line 11) % of our total special education budget.

Table 3

Analysis of Awareness Activities

Type of Awareness	Telephone Number	Response	Percent of Total	Cost	Unit Cost
Flyers	555-2431	68	30.9%	$ 50	$0.74
Newspaper Ad	555-2432	53	24.1%	$ 80	$1.51
Radio	555-2433	42	19.1%	$ 40	$0.95
Billboard	555-2434	57	25.9%	$120	$2.11
TOTAL		220	100.0%	$290	$1.32

This table presents the analysis of effectiveness (plus a cost analysis) of different types of awareness activities. The unit cost is determined by dividing the cost for each type of activity by the response. For example, it cost this hypothetical district $0.74 ($50 divided by 68) for every child located by sending flyers home with school-age children. The total overall cost for awareness for this district is $1.32 per child screened. (See Chapter IV for a more detailed explanation of measuring effectiveness of awareness techniques.)

By using the cost-analysis procedure described in this section of the self-audit, it will be possible for administrators to locate expensive areas of child-find. Alternative ways can then be examined to achieve the same results with less cost.

LFS 2231f

APPENDIX I

Listed below is a microcomputer program to perform the calculations required in each of the worksheets for this document. The program may be keyed into a local microcomputer for use with the self-audit. The program was written on TRS-80 Model III microcomputer. A free copy of this program is available on diskette for the Model III to school districts requesting it. Please send your request and a blank diskette to: Dr. Michael Plog, Illinois State Board of Education, 100 N. First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777.

```
100 CLEAR 10000:DEFINT W,I
110 DIM U$(11),L(11),E(5,3),T$(11),H$(7),A(10,3),W(6)
120 CLS:PRINT@24,"CHILD FIND":PRINT@84,"S E L F   A U D I T"
130 PRINT:PRINT:PRINT"Which of the following do you want?  Type all choi
ces and       press the <ENTER> key.  The Worksheets will be addressed o
ne    at a time."
140 PRINT:PRINTTAB(5)"A--WORKSHEET I"
150 PRINTTAB(5)"B--WORKSHEET II"
160 PRINTTAB(5)"C--WORKSHEET III"
170 PRINTTAB(5)"D--WORKSHEET IV"
180 PRINTTAB(5)"E--ANALYSIS OF AWARENESS"
190 PRINT
200 H$(0)=" WORKSHEET ":H$(1)="ESTIMATING NUMBER OF 3-5 YEAR OLD CHILDRE
N":H$(2)="PRIMARY STUDENTS RECEIVING SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES":H$(3)="
MEASURING ACCURACY OF PAST IDENTIFICATION EFFORTS":H$(4)="COST ANALYSIS"
210 H$(5)="ANALYSIS OF AWARENESS":H$(6)="INPUT INFORMATION FOR":H$(7)="R
ESULTS OF "
220 INPUTA$:FORI=1TOLEN(A$):A=ASC(MID$(A$,I,1))-64:W(A)=1:NEXTI
230 FORQ=1TO5:IFW(Q)=0THEN250
240 ONQGOSUB500  ,700  ,1100 ,1400 ,1700 :GOSUB2000
250 NEXTQ
260 FORQ=1TO5:IFW(Q)<1 OR W(Q)>9THEN280
270 ONQGOSUB2100 ,2300 ,2700 ,2900 ,3100
280 NEXTQ
290 CLS:PRINT@200,"Thanks for using the CHILD FIND SELF-AUDIT.
          If you want another worksheet, type in
   <RUN>."
300 END
```

```
430 REM  ****
440 REM  ****
450 REM  ****
460 REM  ****
470 REM  ****  ENTER VALUES FOR WORKSHEET I
480 REM  ****
490 REM  ****
500 GOSUB3400 :GOSUB3630 :PRINTT$(1);
510 INPUTE(4,1):Z=4:GOSUB590  :RETURN
520 REM  ****
530 REM  ****
540 REM  ****
550 REM  ****
560 REM  ****    ENTER VALUE FOR NUMBER OF STUDENTS SCREENED
570 REM  ****
580 REM  ****
590 PRINTT$(Z);:INPUTE(4,2):RETURN
630 REM  ****
640 REM  ****
650 REM  ****
660 REM  ****
670 REM  ****  ENTER VALUES FOR WORKSHEET II
680 REM  ****
690 REM  ****
700 GOSUB930  :IFA$="Y" THEN RETURN
710 CLS:PRINT"9--To CORRECT";:PRINT@35,":  Ident  :";:PRINT@55,":"
720 PRINT"*--To END";:PRINT@99,":  After  :Screened : Judged"
730 PRINT@163,":Entering :  While  :   As"
740 PRINT@192,"Name of Student";:PRINT@227,": School  :Aged 3-5 :Identif
"
750 V$=STRING$(35,45):V1$="+---------":V$=V$+V1$+V1$+V1$
760 PRINT@256,V$:POKE16916,5
770 X=256:CLS
780 FOR I=1 TO 10:FOR J=1 TO 3:A(I,J)=0:NEXT J,I
790 FORI=1TO10:X=X+64:Y=X+38:PRINT@X,USING"## ? ";I;:LINEINPUTT$(I):IFT$
(I)="9"THEN 4460
800 IF T$(I)="*" THEN 1010
810 FORJ=1TO3:PRINT@Y,;:INPUTA(I,J):IFA(I,J)=9THEN4460
820 Y=Y+10:NEXTJ,I
830 N=10:CLS:PRINT@530,"STORING DATA":GOSUB990
840 GOTO 770
```

```
850 REM  ****
860 REM  ****
870 REM  ****
880 REM  ****
890 REM  **** INSTRUCTIONS & DETERMINING IF INFORMATION
900 REM  **** IS ALREADY ON DISKETTE
910 REM  ****
920 REM  ****
930 CLS:GOSUB3400 :GOSUB3630 :PRINT"Type information for 10 students at
a time.  After each 10      entries have been typed, the information wil
l be saved on a     diskette."
940 PRINT"Enter the student's name, then a <1> for a check or the <ENTER
> key for a blank."
950 PRINT"While entering information about students, press a <9> to
  correct and an <*> to end."
960 PRINT"Is your information already saved on diskette?
     <Y=YES--N=NO>"
970 A$=INKEY$:IF A$="N" THEN 980  ELSE IF A$="Y" THEN RETURN ELSE 970
980 OPEN"O",1,"STUDENTS":RETURN
990 FORI=1TON:PRINT#1,T$(I):FORJ=1TO3:PRINT#1,A(I,J):NEXTJ,I
1000 RETURN
1010 N=I:GOSUB 990  :CLOSE:POKE16916,0:RETURN
1030 REM  ****
1040 REM  ****
1050 REM  ****
1060 REM  ****
1070 REM  ****   ENTER VALUES FOR WORKSHEET III
1080 REM  ****
1090 REM  ****
1100 GOSUB3400 :GOSUB3630 :PRINT"How will the information from Worksheet
 II be entered?":PRINT:PRINTTAB(5)"K--Keyboard":PRINTTAB(5)"D--Diskette"
1110 POKE16916,4
1120 A$=INKEY$:IFA$="K"GOTO1140
1130 IFA$="D" THEN1160 ELSE 1120
1140 CLS:FORI=1TO4:PRINTI;:PRINTT$(I);:INPUTE(5,I-1):NEXTI
1150 GOTO1250
1160 OPEN"I",1,"STUDENTS"
1170 CLS:I=0:PRINT@340,"RETRIEVING INFORMATION"
1180 I=I+1:IFEOF(1) THEN 1240
1190 LINE INPUT#1, B$:IF B$="*" THEN 1240
1200 FORJ=1TO3:INPUT#1,A(0,J)
1210 IF A(0,J)<>0 THEN E(5,J)=E(5,J)+1
1220 NEXTJ
1230 GOTO 1180
1240 CLOSE:E(5,0)=I-1
1250 POKE16916,0:RETURN
```

```
1330 REM  ****
1340 REM  ****
1350 REM  ****
1360 REM  ****
1370 REM  **** ENTER VALUES FOR WORKSHEET IV
1380 REM  ****
1390 REM  ****
1400 GOSUB3400 :GOSUB3630 :Z=5:PRINT"Press <T> if you want to enter tota
l values for the expenses.   Press <A> to enter local/state/federal amou
nts.":POKE16916,6
1410 A$=INKEY$:IFA$=""THEN1410
1420 IF A$="T" THEN 1430 ELSE 1440
1430 F=0:GOSUB1600 :GOTO1490
1440 CLS:PRINT"Local Funds":F=1:GOSUB1600
1450 CLS:PRINT"State Funds":F=2:GOSUB1600
1460 CLS:PRINT"Federal Funds":F=3:GOSUB1600
1470 FORI=1TO3:FORJ=1TO3:E(I,0)=E(I,0)+E(I,J)
1480 E(0,J)=E(0,J)+E(I,J):NEXTJ,I
1490 FORI=1TO3:E(0,0)=E(0,0)+E(I,0):NEXT
1500 IF W(1)=0 GOSUB590
1510 PRINTT$(6);:INPUTX1%
1520 PRINTT$(7);:INPUTE(4,3):PRINTT$(10);:INPUTE(4,0):POKE16916,0:RETURN
1530 REM  ****
1540 REM  ****
1550 REM  ****
1560 REM  ****
1570 REM  **** GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT STATE/FEDERA/LOCAL
1580 REM  ****
1590 REM  ****
1600 FOR K=1 TO 3:PRINTT$(K);:INPUT E(K,F):NEXT:RETURN
1630 REM  ****
1640 REM  ****
1650 REM  ****
1660 REM  ****
1670 REM  ****  ENTER VALUES FOR WORKSHEET V
1680 REM  ****
1690 REM  ****
1700 CLS:PRINT"INPUT INFORMATION FOR ANALYSIS OF AWARENESS"
1710 PRINT:PRINT"You may input up to 10 types of awareness.  Each time y
ou       provide a type of awareness, you will be asked for the response
 and the cost.  Press <ENTER> when finished.":PRINT"Press any key when r
eady to continue."
1720 A$=INKEY$:IFA$=""THEN1720
1730 POKE16916,5:T$(0)="Response":T$(11)="    Cost":
1740 FORI=1TO10:T$(I)="":NEXTI
1750 FOR I=1TO10:CLS:PRINT:PRINT:PRINTI;:INPUT T$(I)
1760 IF T$(I)="" THEN 1780
1770 PRINTTAB(9)T$(0);:INPUTA(I,0):PRINTTAB(9)T$(11);:INPUTA(I,2):PRINT:
PRINT:NEXTI
1780 POKE16916,0:CLS:PRINT@530,"NOW STORING INFORMATION"
1790 OPEN"O",1,"AWARENESS":N=I-1
1800 FORI=1TON
1810 PRINT#1,T$(I)
1820 PRINT#1,A(I,0)
1830 PRINT#1,A(I,2)
1840 NEXTI:CLOSE:RETURN
```

```
1930 REM  ****
1940 REM  ****
1950 REM  ****
1960 REM  ****
1970 REM  ****  LIST RESULTS NOW OR LATER
1980 REM  ****
1990 REM  ****
2000 CLS:PRINT"Do you want ";H$(7);:PRINTH$(0);Q;" listed now or later":
PRINT:PRINT"  (<N> For Now--<L> For Later)"
2010 A$=INKEY$:IFA$="N"THEN2020 ELSEIFA$="L"THENRETURN ELSE 2010
2020 ON Q GOTO 2100 ,2300 ,2700 ,2900 ,3100
2030 REM  ****
2040 REM  ****
2050 REM  ****
2060 REM  ****
2070 REM  **** LIST RESULTS FOR WORKSHEET I
2080 REM  ****
2090 REM  ****
2100 GOSUB3710 :GOSUB3400
2110 L(1)=E(4,1)
2120 L(2)=L(1)*.1216
2130 L(3)=L(1)*.136
2140 L(4)=E(4,2)
2150 L(5)=L(4)/L(3)*L(0)
2160 L(6)=L(4)/L(2)*L(0)
2170 GOTO 3780
2230 REM  ****
2240 REM  ****
2250 REM  ****
2260 REM  ****
2270 REM  **** LIST RESULTS FOR WORKSHEET II
2280 REM  ****
2290 REM  ****
2300 W(Q)=W(Q)*10:GOSUB3400 :CLS:PRINTH$(7);H$(0);Q:PRINTH$(Q):PRINT"How
 do you want the results listed?"
2310 PRINT:PRINTTAB(5)"S--Screen":PRINTTAB(5)"P--Printer":PRINTTAB(5)"D-
-Do Not List"
2320 A$=INKEY$:IFA$="" THEN2320
2330 IFA$="S"THENB=1ELSEIFA$="P"THENB=2ELSEIFA$="D"THEN2530 ELSE2320
2340 U$="#### %"+STRING$(18," ")+"% #### #### ####":U1$="Press <ENTER> t
o continue"
2350 IF B=1 THEN 2400
2360 PRINT"Position paper in printer.  Press <ENTER> when ready."
2370 INPUT A$
2380 LPRINT"COLUMN 1--Name of Student":LPRINT"COLUMN 2--Identified After
 Entering School":LPRINT"COLUMN 3--Screened while aged 3-5":LPRINT"COLUM
N 4--Judged as identifable":LPRINT:LPRINT:LPRINT STRING$(33,32);H
$(0);Q:LPRINT
2390 X=(80-LEN(H$(Q)))/2:LPRINT STRING$(X,32);H$(Q):LPRINT
2400 OPEN"I",1,"STUDENTS"
2410 K=0
2420 FORI=1TO10:IF EOF(1) THEN 2450
2430 LINE INPUT#1,T$(I):FORJ=1TO3:INPUT#1,A(I,J):NEXTJ,I
2440 ON B GOSUB 2460 ,2490 :K=K+10:GOTO 2420
2450 CLOSE:N=I-1:ONB GOSUB 2460 ,2490 :RETURN
2460 CLS:PRINT:PRINT:FORI=1TO10:IF T$(I)="*" THEN 2480
2470 PRINT USING U$;I+K;T$(I);A(I,1);A(I,2);A(I,3):NEXTI
2480 PRINT:PRINT:PRINTU1$:INPUTA2$:RETURN
2490 FOR I=1 TO 10:IF T$(I)="*" THEN 2520
2500 LPRINTTAB(10)USINGU$;I+K;T$(I);A(I,1);A(I,2);A(I,3)
2510 NEXTI
2520 LPRINT
2530 RETURN
```

```
2630 REM  ****
2640 REM  ****
2650 REM  ****
2660 REM  ****
2670 REM  **** LIST RESULTS FOR WORKSHEET III
2680 REM  ****
2690 REM  ****
2700 GOSUB3710 :GOSUB3400 :FORI=1TO4:L(I)=E(5,I-1):NEXT
2710 L(5)=L(4)/L(2)*L(0)
2720 L(6)=L(0)-L(5)
2730 GOTO 3780
2830 REM  ****
2840 REM  ****
2850 REM  ****
2860 REM  ****
2870 REM  **** LIST RESULTS FOR WORKSHEET IV
2880 REM  ****
2890 REM  ****
2900 GOSUB3710 :GOSUB3400 :GOSUB3420
2910 CLS:PRINTH$(7);H$(0);Q:PRINTH$(Q):PRINT
2920 W(Q)=W(Q)*10
2930 L(5)=E(4,2):L(7)=E(4,3):L(8)=E(0,0)/L(5)
2940 L(9)=E(0,0)/L(7):L(10)=E(4,0):L(11)=E(0,0)/L(10)*L(0)
2950 L(6)=X1%
2960 U$(0)="## %"+STRING$(25,32)+"% ###### ###### ###### $$###,####"
2970 FORI=1TO3:PRINTUSINGU$(0);I;T$(I);E(I,1);E(I,2);E(I,3);E(I,0):NEXTI
2980 PRINTUSINGU$(0);4;T$(4);E(0,1);E(0,2);E(0,3);E(0,0)
2990 FORI=5TO11:PRINTUSINGU$(I);I;T$(I);L(I):NEXT
3000 GOTO 3890
3030 REM  ****
3040 REM  ****
3050 REM  ****
3060 REM  ****
3070 REM  **** LIST RESULTS FOR WORKSHEET V
3080 REM  ****
3090 REM  ****
3100 CLS:PRINT@530,"RETRIEVING INFORMATION":OPEN"I",1,"AWARENESS"
3110 W(Q)=W(Q)*10:FORJ=0 TO 3:A(0,J)=0:NEXT J
3120 FORI=1TO10
3130 IF EOF(1) THEN 3160
3140 INPUT#1,T$(I),A(I,0),A(I,2)
3150 NEXTI
3160 CLOSE:N=I-1
3170 CLS:PRINT"RESULTS FOR ANALYSIS OF AWARENESS":PRINT:PRINTTAB(24)":";
TAB(34)":Percent :        : Unit"
3180 PRINT"Type of Awareness";TAB(24)": Response:of Total:  Cost  :  Cos
t"
3190 PRINTSTRING$(63,45)
3200 FORI=1TON:FORJ=0TO2STEP2:A(0,J)=A(0,J)+A(I,J):NEXTJ,I
3210 FORI=1TON:IFA(0,0)=0 THEN A(I,1)=0 ELSE A(I,1)=A(I,0)/A(0,0)*100
3220 IF A(I,0)=0 THEN A(I,3)=0 ELSE A(I,3)=A(I,2)/A(I,0)
3230 A(0,1)=A(0,1)+A(I,1):NEXTI
3240 IF A(0,2)=0 THEN A(0,3)=0 ELSE A(0,3)=A(0,0)/A(0,2)
3250 U$="%"+STRING$(22,32)+"% #####    ###.#%    $$###.##  $$####.##"
3260 FORI=1TON:PRINTUSINGU$;T$(I);A(I,0);A(I,1);A(I,2);A(I,3)
3270 NEXTI
3280 PRINT:PRINT:PRINTUSINGU$;"      TOTAL";A(0,0);A(0,1);A(0,2);A(0,2)/
A(0,0)
3290 GOTO 3890
```

```
3330 REM  ****
3340 REM  ****
3350 REM  ****
3360 REM  ****
3370 REM  **** TO GET LABELS FOR EACH WORKSHEET
3380 REM  ****
3390 REM  ****
3400 RESTORE:FORJ=1TOQ:FORI=1TO11:READT$(I):NEXTI,J
3410 RETURN
3420 ON Q GOTO 3490 ,3430 ,3490 ,3500 ,3430
3430 RETURN
3440 REM  ****
3450 REM  ****
3460 REM  **** TO GET PRINTING FORMATS FOR EACH WORKSHEET
3470 REM  ****
3480 REM  ****
3490 FORI=1TO4:GOSUB3520 :NEXT:FORI=5TO6:GOSUB3530 :NEXT:RETURN
3500 FORI=5TO7:GOSUB3520 :NEXT:FORI=8TO9:GOSUB3540 :NEXTI
3510 I=11:GOSUB3530 :U$(10)="## %"+STRING$(28,32)+"%"+STRING$(19,46)+" $
###,#####":RETURN
3520 GOSUB3550 :U$(I)=U$(I)+" ##,####":RETURN
3530 GOSUB3550 :U$(I)=U$(I)+" ###.# %":RETURN
3540 X=LEN(T$(I)):Y=50-X:U$(I)="## %"+STRING$(X-2,32)+"%"+STRING$(Y,46)+
" $####.##":RETURN
3550 X=LEN(T$(I)):Y=51-X:U$(I)="## %"+STRING$(X-2,32)+"%"+STRING$(Y,46):
RETURN
3560 REM  ****
3570 REM  ****
3580 REM  ****
3590 REM  ****
3600 REM  **** INPUT INFORMATION FOR...(EACH WORKSHEET)
3610 REM  ****
3620 REM  ****
3630 CLS:PRINTH$(6);H$(0);Q:PRINTH$(Q):PRINT:PRINT:RETURN
3640 REM  ****
3650 REM  ****
3660 REM  ****
3670 REM  ****
3680 REM  **** TO SET RESULTS OF EACH LINE EQUAL TO ZERO
3690 REM  ****
3700 REM  ****
3710 L(0)=100:FORI=1TO11:L(I)=0:NEXT:RETURN
3720 REM  ****
3730 REM  ****
3740 REM  ****
3750 REM  **** LISTING RESULTS ON THE SCREEN
3760 REM  ****
3770 REM  ****
3780 CLS:PRINTH$(7);:PRINTH$(0);Q:PRINTH$(Q):PRINT:GOSUB3420
3790 W(Q)=W(Q)*10
3800 FORI=1TO11:IFT$(I)=""THEN3890
3810 PRINTUSINGU$(I);I;T$(I);L(I)
3820 NEXT
```

```
3830 REM  ****
3840 REM  ****
3850 REM  ****
3860 REM  **** PRINTING RESULTS ON PAPER
3870 REM  ****
3880 REM  ****
3890 PRINT@896,"Do you want these results printed on paper? <Y=Yes--N=No
>"
3900 A$=INKEY$:IFA$="Y" THEN 3910  ELSE IF A$="N" THEN 4250  ELSE 3900
3910 CLS:PRINT@265,"Position paper in printer and press <ENTER>"
3920 A$=INKEY$:IFA$=""THEN3920
3930 LPRINTSTRING$(33,32);H$(0);Q:LPRINT
3940 X=(80-LEN(H$(Q)))/2:LPRINTSTRING$(X,32);H$(Q):LPRINT
3950 LPRINTSTRING$(80,61):LPRINT:LPRINT:LPRINT
3960 IF Q=5 THEN 4030
3970 IF Q=4 THEN 4150
3980 FORI=1TO11:IFT$(I)="" THEN 4240
3990 LPRINTTAB(10)USINGU$(I);I;T$(I);L(I)
4000 FORJ=1TO5:LPRINT:NEXT
4010 NEXTI
4020 GOTO 4240
4030 LPRINT TAB(26)":"TAB(37)": Percent :"TAB(60)":   Unit"
4040 LPRINT"Type of Awareness";TAB(26)": Response :of Total :    Cost
 :   Cost"
4050 LPRINT STRING$(80,45)
4060 LPRINT
4070 FOR I=1 TO N
4080 LPRINT TAB(5) USING U$;T$(I);A(I,0);A(I,1);A(I,2);A(I,3)
4090 LPRINT
4100 NEXT I
4110 LPRINT:LPRINT
4120 LPRINT TAB(5) USING U$;"        TOTAL";A(0,0);A(0,1);A(0,2);A(0,2)/
A(0,0)
4130 LPRINT:LPRINT
4140 GOTO 4240
4150 LPRINT TAB(39)"Local  State  Federal    TOTAL"
4160 LPRINT TAB(39)STRING$(30,45):LPRINT:LPRINT
4170 FORI=1TO3:LPRINT TAB(7) USING U$(0);I;T$(I);E(I,1);E(I,2);E(I,3);E(
I,0):LPRINT:NEXTI
4180 LPRINT:LPRINT
4190 LPRINT TAB(7) USINGU$(0);4;T$(4);E(0,1);E(0,2);E(0,3);E(0,0)
4200 LPRINT:LPRINT
4210 FORI=5TO11:LPRINT TAB(7) USINGU$(I);I;T$(I);L(I)
4220 LPRINT:LPRINT
4230 NEXTI
4240 LPRINTSTRING$(80,61):LPRINT:LPRINT
4250 RETURN
```

```
4260 REM  ****
4270 REM  ****
4280 REM  ****
4290 REM  ****
4300 REM  **** LABELS FOR EACH WORKSHEET
4310 REM  ****
4320 REM  ****
4330 DATA Number of students in area to be served,Minimum number of 3-5
year olds in area, Maximum number of 3-5 year olds in area, Number of ch
ildren screened, Minimum percent screened, Maximum percent screened,,,,,
,
4340 DATA,,,,,,,,,Number of primary students receiving services,Number
identified after entering school,Number of students screened while aged
3-5, Number of students judged as identifiable
4350 DATA Percent of students missed by screening, Percent of students a
ccurately screened,,,,,,Expenses for Staff, Expenses for Awareness, Expe
nses for Operations, Total Child Find Expenses
4360 DATA Number of children screened, Number of students referred for d
iagnosis, Number of children needing services, Unit cost for screening,
Unit cost for identification
4370 DATA Total special education budget, Percent funds used for Child F
ind
4380 DATA ,,,,,,,,,,,
4390 REM  ****
4400 REM  ****
4410 REM  ****
4420 REM  ****
4430 REM  **** CORRECTION ROUTINE FOR WORKSHEET II
4440 REM  ****
4450 REM  ****
4460 CLS:PRINT@520,"SORRY--ENTER THIS GROUP OF 10 STUDENTS AGAIN":FORS=1
TO1000:NEXT:GOTO770
```

APPENDIX II

One copy of each worksheet used in this self-audit is provided on the following pages. These worksheets may be copied and altered for local use.

SAMPLE FORMAT -- Distributed as a sample format for local discretionary use only. May be modified and/or copied by local program personnel to meet specific needs.

Worksheet I

ESTIMATING NUMBER OF 3 TO 5 YEAR OLD CHILDREN IN A COMMUNITY

1. Number of students in schools in area to be served ..... _____

2. Minimum number of 3 to 5 year olds (Multiply Line 1 by .1216) ..... _____

3. Maximum number of 3 to 5 year olds (Multiply Line 1 by .136) ..... _____

4. Number of children screened ..... _____

5. Minimum percent screened (Line 4 divided by Line 3. Multiply result by 100.) ..... _____

6. Maximum percent screened (Line 4 divided by Line 2. Multiply result by 100.) ..... _____

SAMPLE CONCLUSION STATEMENT:

In _____ (Year), we screened _____ (Line 4) children ages 3 to 5, which is between _____ (Line 5) % and _____ (Line 6) % of the total 3 to 5 year olds in the community.

SAMPLE FORMAT -- Distributed as a sample format for local discretionary use only. May be modified and/or copied by local program personnel to meet specific needs.

Worksheet II

PRIMARY STUDENTS RECEIVING SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES

NAME OF STUDENT	Identified After Entering School	Screened While Aged 3 - 5	Judged as Identifiable	
TOTALS				
(Carry totals to worksheet III)	(Line 1)	(Line 2)	(Line 3)	(Line 4)

SAMPLE FORMAT -- Distributed as a sample format for local discretionary use only. May be modified and/or copied by local program personnel to meet specific needs.

Worksheet III
MEASURING ACCURACY OF PAST IDENTIFICATION EFFORTS

1. Number of primary students currently receiving special education services (From Worksheet II) - - - - _____

2. Number of students from Line 1 who were identified after entering school (From Worksheet II) - - - - _____

3. Number of students from Line 2 who were screened during ages of 3-5 (From Worksheet II) - - - - - - - _____

4. Number of students from Line 3 who are judged by the panel as identifiable at ages 3-5 (From Worksheet II) - - - - - - -

SAMPLE FORMAT – Distributed as a sample format for local discretionary use only. May be modified and/or copied by local program personnel to meet specific needs.

Worksheet IV

COST ANALYSIS OF CHILD FIND ACTIVITIES

	LOCAL FUNDS (A)	STATE FUNDS (B)	FEDERAL FUNDS (C)	TOTAL FUNDS
1. Expenses for Staff				(Line 1)
2. Expenses for Awareness				(Line 2)
3. Expenses for Operations				(Line 3)
4. Total Expenses for Child Find (Sum Lines 1, 2, and 3)				(Line 4)

5. Number of children screened ---------- _____

6. Number of children referred for diagnosis ---------- _____

7. Number of children identified as needing special education services ---------- _____

8. Unit cost for screening (Line 4 divided by Line 5) ---------- _____

9. Unit cost for identification (Line 4 divided by Line 7) ---------- _____

10. Total expenses for all of special education in local agency ---------- _____

11. Percent of special education funds used for Child Find activities. (Divide Line 4 by Line 10. Multiply result by 100.) ---------- _____

SAMPLE CONCLUSION STATEMENT

In _____ (Year), our screening costs were _____ (Line 4). This represents _____ (Line 8) dollars for every child screened and is _____ (Line 11)% of our total special education budget.